

REMARKS

Claims 4, 6, 8, and 10 are pending in this application.

Applicants have amended claims 4, 6, 8, and 10. The changes made herein to claims 4, 6, 8, and 10 do not introduce any new matter.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 6, 8, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hube* (U.S. Patent No. 5,517,316) in view of *Itoh et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,946,106). As will be explained in more detail below, the combination of *Hube* in view of *Itoh et al.* does not raise a *prima facie* case of obviousness against the subject matter defined in claims 6, 8, and 10, as amended herein.

Applicants have amended claim 6 to specify that the job creation module “copies the executed mother job to create at least one daughter job on completion of the printing of the mother job.” Applicants have made corresponding changes to claims 8 and 10.

The Examiner acknowledges that the *Hube* reference does not disclose a job creation module as specified in claim 6 (and does not disclose the corresponding method and program features recited in claims 8 and 10, respectively). To make up for this deficiency, the Examiner alleges that the *Itoh et al.* reference discloses the claimed job creation module (and the corresponding method and program features). In particular, the Examiner states:

The communication management report of Fig. 6, i.e. at least one daughter job, is printed after at least one or more jobs have been transmitted and printed, i.e. mother jobs, at the apparatus. Furthermore, the print request for the communication management report creates a print job based upon the previously executed jobs and their associated information stored in RAM 9.

Office Action at page 4 (emphasis original).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s characterization of the *Itoh et al.* reference relative to the claimed subject matter. At column 6, line 62, to column 7, line 3, the *Itoh et al.* reference states:

Then, when image data is received, the image data is stored in the image memory 10, decoded by the decoding portion 14, and then printed by the printer 15 onto a sheet of paper.

When the facsimile reception operation of S67 is completed, the program proceeds to S69, in which “RX” data is added to the communication management memory area 9b. The “RX” data indicates that the present communication is a facsimile reception operation. Then, the program proceeds to S55.

In view of the foregoing, in the *Itoh et al.* configuration, it is apparent that what is created after the image data is received and printed is merely the “RX” data, which indicates that the present communication is a facsimile reception operation. As such, the *Itoh et al.* configuration does not create a daughter job as in the claimed subject matter.

Furthermore, with regard to the Examiner’s allegation that the print request for the communication management report creates a print job based upon the previously executed jobs and their associated information, the thus-created print job is not created by copying “the previously executed jobs” as the mother job.

As such, for at least the foregoing reasons, the *Itoh et al.* reference does not disclose or suggest the copying of a mother job to create a daughter job on completion of the printing of the mother job as in the claimed subject matter. Thus, the combination of *Hube* in view of *Itoh et al.* does not raise a *prima facie* case of obviousness against the subject matter defined in claims 6, 8, and 10, as amended herein.

Accordingly, claims 6, 8, and 10, as amended herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Hube* in view of *Itoh et al.*

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of *Hube* in view of *Itoh et al.* and further in view of *Suzuki et al.* (U.S. Patent No. US 6,213,652 B1). As will be explained in more detail below, the combination of *Hube* in view of *Itoh et al.* and further in view of

Suzuki et al. does not raise a *prima facie* case of obviousness against the subject matter defined in claim 4, as amended herein.

Applicants have amended claim 4 to specify that the job creation module “copies the executed mother job to create at least one daughter job on completion of the printing of the mother job.” As such, the arguments set forth above regarding the combination of *Hube* in view of *Itoh et al.* also apply to claim 4. The *Suzuki et al.* reference, which has been cited for its teachings with respect to International Standard ISO/IEC10175-1, does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the combination of the *Hube* and *Itoh et al.* references relative to the claimed subject matter. Thus, the combination of *Hube* in view of *Itoh et al.* and further in view of *Suzuki et al.* does not raise a *prima facie* case of obviousness against the subject matter defined in claim 4, as amended herein.

Accordingly, claim 4, as amended herein, is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Hube* in view of *Itoh et al.* and further in view of *Suzuki et al.*

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reexamination of claims 4, 6, 8, and 10, as amended herein, and submit that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. MIPFP051).

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.



Peter B. Martine
Reg. No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Customer Number 25920